

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA  
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION**

Michael G. Liffbrig,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S</b>
	)	<b>MOTION TO RESET SCHEDULING</b>
vs.	)	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	)	
Federal Election Commission,	)	
	)	Case No. 1:05-cv-123
Defendant.	)	

---

Before the court is the defendant's motion to reset the dispositive motion deadline approved by the court on March 6, 2006.

The plaintiff filed a proposed amended complaint on May 1, 2006, which, according to the defendant, alleges new facts and new causes of action while omitting previous facts and claims. The defendant claims it received a copy of the proposed amended complaint just three days before the court's summary judgment deadline. The defendant's motion seeks to reset the dispositive motion deadline to four weeks after the court rules on the plaintiff's motion to amend his complaint. The defendant states the plaintiff has consented to the motion to reset the deadlines.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that the defendant have thirty (30) days to file any dispositive motions after the court rules on the plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint. The plaintiff shall then have an additional thirty (30) days to file a response in opposition and/or his own dispositive motions. The defendant shall have thirty (30) days thereafter to file a reply. The remaining conditions outlined in the March 6, 2006, order shall continue to be in effect. Also, any additional motions to amend the complaint by the plaintiff will be looked upon with disfavor. The defendant's motion to reset the scheduling deadline is **GRANTED**. (Docket No. 12).

Dated this 1st day of May, 2006.

/s/ Charles S. Miller, Jr.

Charles S. Miller, Jr.

United States Magistrate Judge